

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00432 01 OF 02 272007Z

51

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 BIB-01 AECE-00 INRE-00 /082 W

----- 054310

O P 271830Z JAN 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9770

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0432

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL: SPC DISCUSSION, JANUARY 27

REF: A. STATE 18155

B. USNATO 0375

BEGIN SUMMARY: US MISSION DISCUSSED US COMPROMISE PROPOSAL ON EASTERN FREEZE WITH OTHER DIRECT PARTICIPANTS THE MORNING OF JANUARY 27, AND FORMALLY INTRODUCED IT INTO SPC AT AFTERNOON MEETING. OTHER DELEGATIONS WELCOMED US PROPOSAL AND INDICATED A WILLINGNESS TO WORK WITH IT. FRG REP PROPOSED CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO US TEXT, ON WHICH MISSION REQUESTED WASHGTM COMMENT IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29. END SUMMARY.

1. ON THE MORNING OF JANUARY 27, MISSION OFFICERS DISCUSSED THE US COMPROMISE ON THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL (REF A) WITH ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS EXCEPT LUXEMBOURG. AT THE SPC MEETING ON THE SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00432 01 OF 02 272007Z

AFTERNOON OF JANUARY 27, US REP (PEREZ) PRESENTED THE US PROPOSAL AS A COMPROMISE BETWEEN THE OUTRIGHT, ABRUPT REJECTION OF THE EASTERN PROPOSAL WHICH THE US CONSIDERS THE BEST COURSE, AND THE POSITIONS OF OTHER DELEGATIONS WHO WANTED TO TELL THE

OTHER SIDE THAT THE EASTERN PROPOSAL WAS UNACCEPTABLE IN A WAY THAT WOULD NOT REJECT IT OUTRIGHT.

2. BELGIAN REP (BURNY) WELCOMED THE US PROPOSAL, AND SAID THAT BELGIUM RECOGNIZES THE NEED FOR EARLY GUIDANCE TO THE AHG. BELGIUM IS THEREFORE WILLING TO CHANGE ITS POSITION. HE SAID THE US APPROACH HAS AN ADVANTAGE OVER THE UK AND FRG PROPOSALS IN THAT THE US APPROACH DOES NOT CALL SPECIFICALLY FOR AN EXCHANGE OF DATA. HE REITERATED BELGIAN POSITION THAT A DISARMAMENT AGREEMENT CONTAINING PRECISE DATA WOULD ALSO REQUIRE PRECISE VERIFICATION MEASURES TO AVOID SETTING A BAD PRECEDENT.

3. NETHERLANDS REP (BUWALDA) WELCOMED THE US PROPOSAL, AND SAID THAT THE INITIAL REACTION OF THE HAGUE WAS THAT IF A COMPROMISE IS POSSIBLE ON THE BASIS OF THE US TEXT, THE DUTCH CAN LIVE WITH IT AND WILL NOT STAND IN ITS WAY.

4. FRG REP (HOYNCK) CONSIDERED THE US PROPOSAL A MAJOR STEP FORWARD. HE ANTICIPATED THAT THE FRG WOULD WANT REVISIONS OF FOUR POINTS IN THE US TEXT:

A. HE NOTED THAT THE FOURTH SENTENCE OF THE US TEXT SAID THAT THE NON-INCREASE PROVISION SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED "AS PART OF AN AGREEMENT TO REDUCE". HE RECALLED THAT NAC GUIDANCE ON THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT LEFT OPEN THE QUESTION OF THE FORM OF THE COMMITMENT, AND HE BELIEVED THAT THE US LANGUAGE INADVERTENTLY PREJUDICED THAT QUESTION. HE PROPOSED INSTEAD LANGUAGE CLOSER TO THE ORIGINAL NAV GUIDANCE (C-M(74)30): "...SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED IN CONNECTION WITH AN AGREEMENT IN PHASE I TO REDUCE".

B. HE SAID THAT THE FIFTH SENTENCE IN THE US TEXT SEEMED TOO PALE. HE PROPOSED INSTEAD "ACCORDINGLY THE ALLIES PROPOSE A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WHICH WOULD COME INTO EFFECT ON SIGNATURE OF AN AGREEMENT ON PHASE I REDUCTIONS". THIS REVISION WOULD HELP THE ALLIES WITH PUBLIC OPINION, SHOULD THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL BECOME PUBLIC.

C. FRG CONSIDERED IT AN ESSENTIAL POINT FOR THE PUBLIC PRESENTATION THAT THE OTHER SIDE HAD REFUSED TO DISCUSS DATA IN CONNECTION WITH THE FREEZE. THE US PROPOSAL DROPS ANY REFERENCE SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00432 01 OF 02 272007Z

TO DATA. FRG REP PROPOSED INSERTING AFTER THE FIFTH SENTENCE IN THE US TEXT: "FOR THIS PURPOSE, EACH SIDE WOULD HAVE TO HAVE COLLECTIVELY PROVIDED THE OTHER WITH FULL INFORMATION ON THE LEVEL OF ITS GROUND AND AIR FORCE MANPOWER".

D. FRG REP ALSO PROPOSED TWO BRIEF CHANGES SO THAT US TEXT WOULD USE LANGUAGE ALREADY USED WITH THE EAST: CHANGE "MUCH STUDY" IN FIRST SENTENCE TO "CAREFUL STUDY" PER INITIAL NAC GUIDANCE TO AHG ON EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL (C-M(74)90 REVISED); CHANGE "REDUCTIONS AREA" TO "AREA OF REDUCTIONS".

5. UK REP (LOGAN) ALSO WELCOMED US PROPOSAL. HE SAID THAT PRIOR TO RECEIPT OF US PROPOSAL, UK DELEGATION HAD RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS AUTHORIZING IT TO PROPOSE INSERTION OF "IN PRINCIPLE"

AFTER THE WORD "UNDERSTANDING" IN THE THIRD SENTENCE OF THE FRG TEXT (REF B), IN ORDER TO HELP MEET US CONCERN THAT THE FRG TEXT COULD LEAD TO PROTRACTED NEGOTIATIONS ON A FREEZE. HE SAID LONDON, OF COURSE, WOULD STUDY THE US TEXT, AND HE THOUGHT THAT UK COULD PROBABLY AGREE TO THE AMENDMENTS WHICH FRG REP HAD JUST SUGGESTED. HE AGREED WITH FRG REP PARTICULARLY ON THE NEED TO BRING DATA INTO THE DEFINITIVE ALLIED RESPONSE TO THE EAST.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 00432 02 OF 02 272030Z

41

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 BIB-01 AECE-00 INRE-00 /082 W

----- 054635

O P 271830Z JAN 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9771

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0432

HE DISAGREED WITH THE BELGIAN REP THAT INCLUSION OF DATA IN THIS MANNER RAISED ANY SPECIAL VERIFICATION ISSUE, SINCE THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT UNDER EXISTING NAC GUIDANCE WOULD NOT COME INTO EFFECT UNTIL CONCLUSION OF A SATISFACTORY FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT, WHICH WOULD, OF COURSE, CONTAIN VERIFICATION PROVISIONS. THE US AND FRG TEXTS CHANGE NOTHING IN THIS REGARD. THE BELGIAN REP WOULD BE RIGHT IF A FREEZE WOULD TAKE EFFECT PRIOR TO CONCLUSION OF THE FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT, BUT NEITHER THE US NOR THE FRG IS PROPOSING THIS. UK REP HOWEVER QUESTIONED US LANGUAGE THAT THE NON-INCREASE PROVISION WOULD COME INTO EFFECT ON "SIGNATURE" OF THE PHASE I AGREEMENT. UK HAD FAVORED WORDING THAT THE PROVISION WOULD COME INTO EFFECT AS SOON AS PHASE I AGREEMENT "HAD BEEN REACHED" IN ORDER TO ALLOW FOR THE POSSIBILITY THAT NON-INCREASE WOULD COME INTO EFFECT WITH A FRAMEWORK PHASE I AGREEMENT, PRIOR TO RESOLUTION OF EVERY DETAIL.

6. CANADIAN REP (ROY) NOTED THAT COUNTRIES THE MOST CONCERNED WITH PUBLIC OPINION SEEMED READY TO CONSIDER THE LATEST US

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00432 02 OF 02 272030Z

PROPOSAL. (COMMENT: HE SEEMED TO BE REFERRING IN PARTICULAR TO INTERVENTIONS BY DUTCH AND BELGIAN REPS, WHO WERE THE ONLY OTHER SUPPORTERS OF THE UNILATERAL DECLARATION APPROACH.) HE CONSIDERED THE US COMPROMISE MUCH MORE POSITIVE THAN THE PREVIOUS US TEXT, AND SAID HE WAS READY TO RECOMMEND THE US PROPOSAL TO HIS AUTHORITIES.

7. US REP, WITH RESPECT TO POINT A RAISED BY THE FRG REP, SAID HE DID NOT BELIEVE THE US LANGUAGE PREJUDICED THE QUESTION OF THE FORM OF THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT. HE BELIEVED THAT THE WORD "AGREEMENT" AS USED IN THE FOURTH SENTENCE OF THE US TEXT SHOULD BE TAKEN IN A BROAD SENSE, MEANING THE OVERALL AGREEMENT ON PHASE I, WHETHER OR NOT ALL UNDERSTANDINGS ARE INCLUDED IN ONE DOCUMENT. REGARDING THE FRG REP'S POINT B, HE SAID HE DID NOT LIKE SAYING THAT THE ALLIES "PROPOSE" THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT, SINCE THIS MIGHT MAKE THE TEXT MORE OF A COUNTER-PROPOSAL THAN IS NECESSARY. REGARDING THE FRG POINT C ON DATA, WHICH THE UK REP HAD ALSO RAISED, US REP OPPOSED INCLUSION OF REFERENCE TO DATA IN THE ALLIED RESPONSE TO THE EAST, SINCE THIS COULD GIVE THE OTHER SIDE THE OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE MEANINGLESS COMPROMISE PROPOSALS, AND INCREASE THE PRESSURE ON THE ALLIES TO DISCUSS THE EASTERNFREEZE PROPOSAL. FOR EXAMPLE THE EAST WOULD HAVE AN OPENING TO PROPOSE USE OF ALLIED DATA FOR PURPOSES OF THE FREEZE ONLY, WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO USE OF DATA FOR REDUCTIONS.

8. ITALIAN REP (SPINELLI) SAID THAT POINT B IN THE FRG AMENDMENTS TO THE US TEXT WAS THE KEY TO A COMPROMISE. THE USE OF THE WORDS "THE ALLIES PROPOSE A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT, ETC." CHANGED NOTHING, BUT WAS IMPORTANT FOR USE WITH PUBLIC OPINION WHEN THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL BECOMES PUBLIC.

9. UK REP THOUGHT THAT DATA HAD EMERGED AS THE MOST DIFFICULT REMAINING ISSUE BETWEEN THE US AND FRG PROPOSALS. HE SUGGESTED ON A PERSONAL BASIS BRINGING INTO THE US TEXT SOME REFERENCE TO THE NAC'S PRE-CHRISTMAS GUIDANCE TO THE AHG ON THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL, C-M(74)90(REVISED), WHICH INSTRUCTED THE AHG TO PRESENT CERTAIN DIFFICULTIES IN THE EASTERN PROPOSAL, INCLUDING THE ABSENCE OF AN EXCHANGE OF DATA. HE SUGGESTED ADDING AT THE END OF THE FIRST SENTENCE IN THE US TEXT "AND GIVE REASONS STATED IN C-M(74)90(REVISED). THEY

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00432 02 OF 02 272030Z

SHOULD MAINTAIN THEIR EFFORTS TO ENGAGE THE EAST IN THE QUESTION OF DATA." NETHERLANDS AND CANADIAN REPS THOUGHT THE AHG SHOULD REPEAT ALL OF THE REASONS STATED IN THAT DOCUMENT, AND NOT SIMPLY SINGLE OUT DATA. NETHERLANDS REP (SUPPORTED BY OTHERS) SUGGESTED PUTTING REFERENCE TO THIS DOCUMENT AT END OF THE

GUIDANCE.

10. SPC DECIDED TO MEET AGAIN ON EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL ON WEDNESDAY MORNING, JANUARY 29 (IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE NAC MEETING WHICH WILL NOT HAVE THIS SUBJECT ON ITS AGENDA). SPC WILL AGAIN HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO MEET ON THIS SUBJECT ON JANUARY 30. NAC WILL MOST PROBABLY CONSIDER THIS ISSUE AT A SPECIAL MEETING ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 31.

11. COMMENT: MISSION BELIEVES THAT IF FRG TAKES LITERALLY THE US LANGUAGE THAT THE NON-INCREASE PROVISION SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED "AS PART OF AN AGREEMENT TO REDUCE", AND IF FRG CONSEQUENTLY DECIDES THAT THIS WOULD PREJUDICE THE FORM OF THE NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT, FRG WILL NOT BE ABLE TO AGREE TO THIS US LANGUAGE. AS DEPARTMENT IS AWARE, THIS IS AN OLD ISSUE, AND FRG HAS CONSISTENTLY SOUGHT TO KEEP THE NON-INCREASE PROVISION SEPARATE FROM THE MAIN PHASE I AGREEMENT. US HAS HELD THAT IT WAS PREMATURE TO DECIDE HOW THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT SHOULD BE HANDLED IN CONTEXT OF PHASE I AGREEMENT.

12. ACTION REQUESTED: MISSION REQUESTS ALTERNATE LANGUAGE ON THIS PARTICULAR POINT, IN CASE THE FRG TAKES A STRONG LINE THAT THE US LANGUAGE WOULD PREJUDICE THE FORM OF THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT, AND MISSION REQUESTS GUIDANCE ON THE POINTS RAISED IN PARA 4 B, C, AND D ABOVE, AS WELL AS ON THE UK PREFERENCE FOR THE PHRASE "HAD BEEN REACHED", AS NOTED IN PARA 5 ABOVE, AND THE UK IDEA OF RESOLVING THE DATA ISSUE BY REFERENCE TO THE NAC PRE-CHRISTMAS GUIDANCE, PER PARA 9 ABOVE. MISSION REQUESTS THIS GUIDANCE IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING ON WEDNESDAY JANUARY 29.

BRUCE.

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 27 JAN 1975  
**Decapton Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decapton Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO00432  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750188/abbrzhve.tel  
**Line Count:** 250  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A. STATE 18155 B. USNATO 0375  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by MartinML>; APPROVED <03 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL: SPC DISCUSSION, JANUARY 27  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA  
BONN  
LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006